

Week 6

Social Dimensions

박소현

- Space and Society
 - Two way process

- 5 themes
 - Relationship between society and space
 - Interrelated concepts of the public realm and public life
 - Notion of neighborhood
 - Safety and security
 - Accessibility – Equity

- People and Space
 - (society) and (environment)
 - Environmental determinism
 - Environmental possibilism
 - Environmental probabilism
 - Design matters but not absolutely
 - Urban designers can not ‘make’ places, but they can create more ‘place potential’

– Optimistic urban designer:

- Good streets, sidewalks, parks, and other public spaces bring out the best in human nature and provide the settings for a civil and courteous society.
- Everything will be fine if we can just get the design

– Pessimistic urban designer:

- Small urban parks will inevitably attract the undesirables
- Porch will attract nosy neighbors

- The public realm

 - » 건축과 도시설계의 특성 차이

 - Function of the public realm

 - Forum for political action – democratic
 - Neutral/common ground for social interaction
 - Stage for social learning

 - Decline of the public realm

 - Social and civic functions to private realm
 - Leisure, entertainment, consumption – at home
 - Privatization
 - False notion (?) city, polis, new space

- The Public Realm, (continued)
 - Physical and socio cultural public realms
 - External public space
 - Internal ‘public’ space
 - External, internal ‘quasi–public’ space
 - Spectrum of ‘public–ness’ in public realm
 - Accessibility
 - Public space → public life
 - Public space → social space
 - ‘Third place’ (Oldenburg) – Starbucks, Bookstore...

- Neighborhood

- Neighborhood concept

- Providing identity and character – sense of place
 - Pragmatic way of planning urban area – ‘good’ unit
 - Areas of greater social interaction

- Well-developed tradition of neighborhood design:

- meaning, relevancy questioned:

- Physical neighborhood vs social communities

- Issues regarding neighborhood design concepts:

- Size :
 - » city as a whole; city district of 100,000 or more; street neighborhood (J Jacobs)

 - Boundaries:
 - » Clear boundaries vs. no beginning or ends

 - Social relevance and meaning
 - » Community of place → community of interest

 - Social mix and ‘balanced communities’
 - » Social engineering, ‘socially balanced communities’ questioned, yet pursued, why?
-
- Dogma vs. desirable design principles
 - Local context + prevailing social, economic, political realities

- Safety and Security
 - Natural threats vs human threats
 - Human threats, real / imagined, increasing
 - Road safety and fear of crime
 - Safety and security --- the public realm
 - Prerequisite of successful urban design
 - Privatization, voluntary exclusion
 - Club, gated communities, “gating”

– Fear of victimization

- Fear of certain environments:
 - Dark alleys, deserted areas,
 - Gathering or gathering areas of “undesirable groups of people”
- Crime vs. Invidities (street barbarism)
- Fear vs. Risk
- Feeling safe vs. Being safe

Approach to crime prevention

table 6.1.
Carmona
(2003), p.
121

TABLE 6.1 Situational approaches				
	<i>JANE JACOBS</i>	<i>OSCAR NEWMAN</i>	<i>CPTED</i>	<i>BILL HILLIER</i>
CONTROL OF SPACE/ TERRITORIALITY	Clear demarcation between public and private space.	<i>Territoriality</i> – capacity of the physical environment to create perceived zones of territorial influence (including mechanisms symbolising boundaries and defining a hierarchy of increasingly private zones).	<i>Natural access control</i> aimed at reducing opportunities by denying access to the crime target. <i>Territorial reinforcement</i> – physical design strategies creating or extending a sphere of influence so that users of a property develop a sense of proprietorship.	Spaces integrated with other spaces, so that pedestrians are encouraged to see into and move through them.
SURVEILLANCE	Need for ‘eyes upon the street’ belonging to street’s ‘natural proprietors’ (both residents and users). Enhanced by a diversity of activities and functions that naturally create peopled places.	<i>Surveillance</i> – capacity of physical design to provide surveillance opportunities for residents and their agents.	<i>Natural surveillance</i> as a result of the routine use of property.	Surveillance provided by people moving through spaces.
ACTIVITY	Sidewalks need ‘users on it fairly continuously, both to add to the number of effective eyes on the street and to induce people in buildings along the street to watch the sidewalks in sufficient number’.	Rejects the argument that more activity on the street and the presence of commercial uses necessarily reduces street crime.	Argues for reduced through-movement and hence reduced levels of activity.	As feeling safe depends on areas being in continuous occupation and use, areas should be designed to enable this (e.g. by making them better integrated with regard to the movement system).

- Accessibility and Exclusion
 - Three forms of access: (Carr et al, 1992)
 - Visual access
 - Symbolic access
 - Physical access
 - Management of the Public Realm
 - Hard control vs. soft control
 - Some strategies:
 - distinguishing between harm and harmless activities
 - Increasing general tolerance toward free use
 - Separating the activities of groups with low tolerance
 - Providing marginal places for extremely free behavior

– Exclusion and the public realm

- Certain exclusion – needed
- Access control
- Flusty (1997)'s exclusion practice strategies
 - Stealthy space: intervening objects or level changes
 - Slippery space: missing paths of approach
 - Crusty space: obstructions such as walls, gates
 - Prickly: i.e. ledges sloped to inhibit sitting
 - Jetterly space: patrol, surveillance
 - Fee / dress codes /

- Equitable Environments
 - Disability, accessibility, and exclusion
 - Physical, social disability
 - Mobility, accessibility, and exclusion
 - Transport, mobility,
 - Social segregation and fragmentation
 - Merits of integration versus segregation in layout
 - Desire for a more inclusive public realm
 - Desire for exclusiveness, segregation
 - Ability of urban design and urban designers
 - Ethical issues in urban design

- Conclusion
 - Issues concerning values
 - Difficult choices in design decisions
 - Role of design in delivering particular social goals
 - Public space – ending, or changing,
 - More challenging and difficult questions
 - Aim: provision of an accessible, safe and secure, equitable public realm for all